



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/559,950

11/08/2006

Roger William Frank Ashton

10557/323978

1482

30559

7590

07/15/2009

DIANA HOUSTON  
SMITH & NEPHEW, INC.  
1450 BROOKS ROAD  
MEMPHIS, TN 38116

EXAMINER

SWEET, THOMAS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3774

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/15/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                                      |                                      |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/559,950 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>ASHTON ET AL. |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b><br>Thomas J. Sweet   | <b>Art Unit</b><br>3774              |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas J. Sweet. (3) Jeff Sharp.

(2) Renae Bailey. (4) Tom Wolf.

Date of Interview: 14 July 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tornier (US 6454809), Garnett (US 3787132).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The rejection was questioned and the rejection as contemplated was explained. The Examiner suggested tightening the language of claim 7 and incorporating it into claim 1. The intended use feature of the female location feature (dovetail/conical portion) adjustably rotating within the fixing member defines over the prior art rejection as well as defining conical surfaces capable of rotating in the mixing member.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| /Thomas J Sweet/<br>Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3774 |  |
|---|--|